

MINUTES OF THE
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
April 9, 2003
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Terry Ellis, Peoria, Chairman
Mike Hutchinson, Mesa, Vice Chairman
#George Hoffman, Apache Junction
Todd Hileman, Avondale
*Joe Blanton, Buckeye
Jon Pearson, Carefree
*Usama Abujbarah, Cave Creek
Patrice Kraus for Donna Dreska, Chandler
Dick Yost, El Mirage
#Tim Pickering, Fountain Hills
David Evertsen, Gila Bend
Urban Giff, Gila River Indian Community
George Pettit, Gilbert
Pam Kavanaugh for Ed Beasley, Glendale
Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear
*Tom Morales, Guadalupe

Horatio Skeete, Litchfield Park
Tom Martinsen, Paradise Valley
Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
#Cynthia Seelhammer, Queen Creek
*Bryan Meyers, Salt River
Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Jan Dolan, Scottsdale
Bill Pupo, Surprise
Will Manley, Tempe
Ralph Velez, Tolleson
Shane Dille, Wickenburg
Mark Fooks, Youngtown
Dale Buskirk for Victor Mendez, ADOT
Tom Buick for David Smith,
Maricopa County
Ken Driggs, Valley Metro/RPTA

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by videoconference or telephone conference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Terry Ellis, Peoria, at 12:05 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Ellis stated that transit tickets were available following the meeting from Valley Metro/RPTA. Parking validation was available from MAG staff for those that parked in the parking garage.

Chairman Ellis announced that Cynthia Seelhammer and Tim Pickering were attending the meeting via telephone conference call, and George Hoffman was participating via videoconference call. He reminded Committee members to have their microphones turned on when speaking so that those participating via telephone could hear the meeting. Ms. Seelhammer, Mr. Pickering, and Mr. Hoffman acknowledged they were present and could hear the meeting.

3. Call to the Audience

Chairman Ellis stated that public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations. When two minutes have elapsed, a yellow light will come on notifying the speaker that they have one minute to sum up. At the end of the three minute time period, a red light will come on. Chairman Ellis stated that for members of the audience who wish to speak, comment cards are available from the staff. Staff will then bring the cards to the Chairman. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for non-agenda items.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from DD Barker, who stated that she came to the meeting on the bus. Ms. Barker stated that buses have only two bike racks, and demonstrated her folding bike as an option when the racks are full. She stated that multimodalism is good and performed a cartwheel. Ms. Barker stated that the Management Committee has the power to make recommendations to the Regional Council. She stated that HB 2292 passed without the amendments to institute funding for a multimodal system nor establish the Transportation Policy Committee to be in control of MAG's studies, plans and future transportation investments. Ms. Barker stated that if a plan is not financially constrained, it should be called a study. Therefore, the TIP is a study and not a legal plan. Ms. Barker stated that the unfunded projects should not be in the TIP. She added that we need to change to better transportation projects that are cleaner burning. Ms. Barker quoted the State motto, "Ditat Deus," or "God Enriches." Chairman Ellis thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Joseph Ryan, who provided material to those attending the meeting. The material was entered into the permanent record. He commented on the marketing program for Transit 2000, that states "light rail rapid transit." Mr. Ryan remarked that the average speed of light rail on Central Avenue is estimated at 12 mph, so how is this rapid? Mr. Ryan stated that in the new starts report, there is a reported reduction of energy consumption of 823,282 millions of BTUs annually. On the other hand, in the justification summary page attached with the letter dated August 2002, savings are reported at 8,232,282 millions of BYUs annually. Mr. Ryan stated that three lanes will be taken out along Central to make way for light rail. His time expired and he stated that he needed more time because he was commenting on a federal document. Mr. Ryan stated that on either side of the railroad tracks there are no curbs. Traffic will move more slowly and will be more congested. When you increase congestion, there will be more pollution. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Ryan for his comments.

4. Executive Director's Report

Dennis Smith stated that Philip Mangano, Executive Director of the US Interagency Council on Homelessness, will be in the Valley on April 15 and 16. He stated that the cities of Tempe, Phoenix, and Mesa will sponsor tours. Mr. Smith stated that the Interagency Council is part of the Domestic Policy Council within the Executive Office of the President and is responsible for the coordination of 15 federal agencies in their response to reduce and end homelessness. He noted that Charlene Moran Flaherty, is the staff contact.

Mr. Smith gave an update on the MAG Regional Town Hall, held March 28. Mr. Smith stated that more than 100 "regional visionaries" attended the Town Hall to discuss transportation.

Participants included those from leadership groups. He remarked that the goal was to get input from those who do not normally participate in the MAG transportation planning process. Mr. Smith stated that a final report summarizing each discussion panel's recommendations, as well as outcomes from the group consensus, is being compiled. He mentioned that the guest speaker was Katie Lincoln from the Lincoln Foundation, who spoke on "Making Sense of Place, Phoenix: the Urban Desert." Mr. Smith noted that sponsorships funded almost the entire event.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG hosted the Intermodal Planning Group for review of the MAG Work Program on April 3. He stated that this is the annual review by federal and state agencies that fund some of MAG's programs. Mr. Smith noted that only minor comments were received.

Mr. Smith introduced Julie Kicksey, who filled a vacancy in the Environmental Programs Division as an Air Quality Planner I. Ms. Kicksey graduated from Minnesota State University Moorhead with a bachelor's degree in finance and a minor in economics. Prior to MAG, she worked as an intern for Maricopa County.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Chairman Ellis stated that public comment will be received before taking action on the consent items. Each speaker is provided with a total of three minutes to comment on the consent agenda. After hearing public comments, any member of the Committee can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered individually. Chairman Ellis stated that agenda items #5A through #5E were on the consent agenda.

Chairman Ellis noted that Jan Dolan had requested that agenda item #5D, Proposal to Accelerate Certain Segments for Rubberized Asphalt, be discussed and Frank Fairbanks requested that agenda item #5E, Requested Changes for the MAG Regional Freeway Program, be discussed.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Ms. Barker, who commented on agenda item #5B, FY 2002-2003 Annual Transit Performance Report. She noted that RPTA is under contract to put the transit plan into MAG's long range plan. Ms. Barker stated that the many people have brought their problems with the trolley forward, but there is no mention of these concerns. Ms. Barker commented that the federal rules state you should examine ways to use existing projects better. MAG has a responsibility to be fiscally constrained. Chairman Ellis thanked Ms. Barker for her comments.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Mr. Ryan, who stated that he would love to have rapid transit from Sky Harbor International Airport to his home and to the hospital in Sun City West. Mr. Ryan stated that the hospital is the largest employer in Sun City West and operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He suggested having a multimodal terminal at Sky Harbor Airport. Mr. Driggs asked for clarification of the agenda item Mr. Ryan was addressing. Mr. Ryan replied that he was commenting on the transportation plan. He explained that the EIS eliminated a multimodal station at 22nd Avenue at Jefferson and Washington. The EIS shows 316 people boarding on both stations. Mr. Ryan stated that the trolley in 20 years will not serve any of us. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Ryan for his comments.

Mr. Velez moved to recommend approval of consent agenda items #5A, #5B, and #5C. Mr. Dille seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Approval of March 12, 2003 Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee, by consent, approved the March 12, 2003 meeting minutes.

5B. FY 2002-2003 Annual Transit Performance Report

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended acceptance of the RPTA Annual Transit Performance Report, contingent upon any air quality conformity analysis that may be required. The Annual Transit Performance Report, formerly known as the Short Range Transit Report, is prepared and updated annually by the Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority on behalf of MAG. In addition to providing recommendations for transit improvements over the next year, the report also includes a summary of the regional transit system's operating characteristics from Fiscal Year 2001-2002. The report was developed using input from MAG member agencies and citizen participation efforts that are normally conducted throughout the year.

5C. Regional Transportation Plan - Phase II Contract Amendment

The Management Committee, by consent, recommended approval to increase the contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for the Regional Transportation Plan - Phase II, from \$499,917 to an amount not to exceed \$559,917. The MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes a total of \$750,000 for consultant services for Phase II of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). On October 30, 2002, the Regional Council approved contracting with HDR Engineering, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$500,000, to assist in the development of the RTP. At that time, it was noted that a portion of the \$250,000 balance might be required later, depending on possible study scope revisions. Certain revisions are now being proposed for the scope that would result in an increase of \$60,000 in the total amount of the contract with HDR. The increased contract amount is needed to cover additional public attitude surveying (\$45,000), and a project video (\$15,000).

5D. Proposal to Accelerate Certain Segments for Rubberized Asphalt

This item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has been working with MAG member agencies to advance certain segments for the application of rubberized asphalt. These advancements would be considered under the MAG Highway Acceleration Policy adopted by the MAG Regional Council in March 2000. This policy provides for the advancement of projects by members if such accelerations do not impact the scheduled delivery of other projects. ADOT has developed a map showing the proposed accelerations, which is attached. Such proposed accelerations of highway segments include: 1) Loop 101 between McKellips Road and McDonald Drive (advanced from Fall to Spring of 2004); 2) State Route 51 from Shea Boulevard to Bell Road (advanced from Spring 2004 to Fall 2003); 3) I-17 from Greenway Road to Utopia Road, near Loop 101 (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004); 4) I-10 from Ray Road to Baseline Road (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004) 5) I-10 from Van Buren Street to 17th Avenue (advanced from Spring 2006 to Spring 2004); 6) I-10 from 27th Avenue to 67th Avenue (advanced from Spring 2006 to Fall 2004). The Transportation Review Committee unanimously recommended approval of the regional freeway accelerations as presented at their

March 27, 2003, meeting. ADOT has also prepared a revised table for the accelerated rubberized asphalt surfacing segments.

Ms. Dolan stated that the City of Scottsdale has freed up money that would enable them to accelerate the installation of rubberized asphalt on two additional freeway segments. Ms. Dolan advised that ADOT has indicated their agreement to the accelerations. She stated that the Frank Lloyd Wright to Tatum Boulevard segment on Loop 101 would be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Fall 2004. The segment from McDonald Drive to 90th Street would be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Spring 2004. Ms. Dolan stated that the City is requesting that the accelerations be incorporated in the schedule. She added that the City is advancing the funds and there would be no negative impact to the rest of the system.

Chairman Ellis asked MAG staff to comment. Eric Anderson stated that as long as Scottsdale would be advancing the funds, and other projects would remain in place, the system would not be affected.

Mr. Hutchinson asked the process for accelerations. Mr. Anderson explained that a city would work with ADOT and would provide necessary funding. He added that the project acceleration would then come back through the MAG process.

Dale Buskirk asked for clarification of limits of the amended accelerations with the existing projects. Ms. Dolan stated that the Mountain View to Raintree segment would be changed to include the segment just slightly north of Raintree in 2003. The City is asking whether ADOT could accommodate within the existing schedule. She added that if ADOT could not accommodate this change, the City would understand. Mr. Buskirk stated that at this point the design is at 95 percent. If expanding the limits is an issue, ADOT will attempt to adjust. However, at this point, that has not yet been determined. Ms. Dolan stated that the City acknowledges that and appreciates the cooperative effort.

Patrice Kraus asked if ADOT considers the availability of the rubberized asphalt material in accommodating acceleration requests. Mr. Anderson replied that would certainly be a consideration.

Ms. Dolan moved to recommended that the proposed accelerations in agenda item #5D be approved, including the amendments that the section of Loop 101 through Scottsdale from McDonald to 90th Street be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Spring 2004; that the segment from Frank Lloyd Wright to Tatum be accelerated from Fall 2005 to Fall 2004; and that the segment north of Raintree to Frank Lloyd Wright be accelerated from 2005 to 2003, depending on ADOT's ability to accommodate the acceleration, with the City of Scottsdale advancing the funding for these amended accelerations. Mr. Martinsen seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5E. Requested Changes for the MAG Regional Freeway Program

This item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion.

The Arizona Department of Transportation has requested that a \$1.4 million new project be added to the MAG Regional Freeway Program to provide for additional noise mitigation measures at two locations. The first location is the Price Freeway interchange at Guadalupe

Road. The other location is along the Red Mountain Freeway between Center Street and Mesa Drive. The scope of work for these locations primarily includes construction of new noise walls at an estimated cost of \$1.0 million. The proposed project also includes \$400,000 of RARF funding for a screen wall between Mesa Drive and Gilbert Road. Through an IGA with Maricopa County, an additional \$1.7 million is being provided for the remaining costs of the screen wall. The noise walls are being proposed since noise readings taken after the freeway was open to traffic were found to exceed the acceptable noise mitigation standard. According to the ADOT Noise Attenuation Policy, reasonable noise mitigation measures must be pursued if noise levels exceed 65 Db levels along highways for which development occurred prior to the date of public knowledge for the new highway. Since the freeway segments have opened, ADOT has conducted noise studies to determine the actual noise levels in neighborhoods adjacent to the freeways. Based on these noise studies, and given development had occurred prior to the date of public knowledge, ADOT has determined additional noise mitigation is needed. A review of the net impact of these changes indicates that the cash balances for the MAG Regional Freeway Program are adequate to accommodate the requested changes.

Mr. Fairbanks expressed concern for creating a precedent on starting construction of additional items as part of the Regional Freeway Program. He stated that there are well documented needs around the system that have gone unmet. Mr. Fairbanks stated that screen walls are a lower priority than other needs. He stated that he heard that this was not setting a precedent, and MAG believes this is a unique situation. Mr. Fairbanks stated that if assurances are given that this screen walls project is a unique situation and not setting a precedent, he would have no objection. He acknowledged that this project is important to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the City of Mesa.

Mr. Anderson stated that screen walls have been added on a few occasions, such as certain segments of the Agua Fria and Pima Freeways, and have been committed on a portion of the Red Mountain Freeway. He added that this project resulted from extensive negotiations, and is a unique situation. Mr. Anderson advised, that in his judgment, it would not set a precedent. Mr. Fairbanks acknowledged his satisfaction.

Mr. Fairbanks moved to recommend approval of the requested change to add the new project to provide additional noise mitigation at the Price Freeway and Guadalupe Road interchange and on the Red Mountain Freeway between Center and Mesa Drive and to provide a portion of the funding for a screen wall on the Red Mountain between Mesa Drive and Gilbert Road, with the understanding that a precedent would not be set for screen walls. Mr. Hutchinson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Ellis noted that a comment card had been turned in by Blue Crowley for agenda item #5B; however, the Committee had already taken action on this item.

Steve Olson replaced Ms. Dolan.

6. Update on the MAG High Capacity Transit Study

Dawn Coomer addressed the Management Committee. Ms. Coomer introduced herself, noting that the agenda item was being presented for information and discussion, and that no action would be requested. She explained that at the March 27, 2003 meeting of the Transportation Review Committee (TRC), members expressed concern about accepting the Study prior to

having access to a completed final report and asked several questions about the High Capacity Transit Study (HCT). She noted that other issues and concerns were voiced prior to the meeting and the information enclosed with the agenda packet summarized many of the comments received and provided responses to those questions. Ms. Coomer added that today's presentation would provide an overview of the study with a focus on key recommendations. The consultant is also prepared to present an overview of the questions raised by the TRC. Approval of the Study is being delayed until the questions are addressed, with possible approval next month. Ms. Coomer stated that delays in the project schedule were a result of the decision to incorporate a run of the MAG transportation model into the analysis of the project. Ms. Coomer then introduced David McCrossan of the IBI Group to provide an overview of the study and address concerns raised by the TRC.

Mr. McCrossan explained that the purpose of the HCT was to identify forms of effective high-capacity transit services including commuter rail along freight corridors, and light rail (LRT) and bus rapid transit (BRT) in other corridors. The project also addressed the role of feeder bus networks to serve rail stations and park and ride lots. The work for the project was divided into six project milestones. Work began in February of 2002 with the creation of a public and agency involvement plan. Member agencies were interviewed at the beginning of the project. Other key tasks undertaken in the project include an evaluation of peer transit systems, corridor assessments, cost effectiveness rankings, benefit-cost analysis and application of the MAG model forecasts.

Mr. McCrossan showed a map of the original corridor analysis. Mr. McCrossan explained that the corridors included commuter rail along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad and the Union Pacific (UP) railroads. He stated that Express bus was included in the early analysis along freeway corridors; however, those corridors were moved to the RPTA/Valley Metro Regional Transit System Study for consideration in that study. Mr. McCrossan added that light rail/dedicated bus rapid transit corridors were also analyzed along Baseline, Bell, Camelback, Chandler Boulevard, Glendale/Cactus, 59th Avenue, I-10 West, Main Street in Mesa, Metrocenter/I-17, Northern, Power Road, SR-51, Scottsdale/Rural, Union Pacific Chandler and UP Tempe.

In evaluating the feasibility of commuter rail, the analysis done in the study found that projected boardings along proposed commuter rail lines in the MAG region are comparable to other peer commuter rail systems operating successfully in the western United States. Some of the projected ridership numbers are higher for the MAG system than other new start-up systems.

Mr. McCrossan moved on to conclusions and recommendations of the study. The recommended network includes both commuter rail and an arterial-based LRT/BRT network. The LRT/BRT system provides an important form of mobility. Most corridor demand appears to be more suited for BRT; although there are a few exceptions and later growth may require LRT. Commuter rail can provide regional connectivity, longer-haul trips for conventional commutes. The contribution of commuter rail to the regional transportation system is limited for non-commute trips.

Mr. McCrossan showed a map of the recommended High Capacity Transit network. Mr. McCrossan added that the corridors identified are not alignment specific, with the exception of the commuter rail corridors. He described the service elements of commuter rail. A phase one

service would have three peak period trains. Phase one service would move toward the city center in the a.m., and toward the suburban areas in the p.m. A phase three service would have 15 minute peak service, 30 minute peak service outbound, and off-peak service with 30 to 60 minute frequency. Mr. McCrossan displayed the total estimated capital cost and daily ridership projections for commuter rail.

Mr. McCrossan then showed the estimated capital costs and projected daily ridership for the LRT/BRT corridors. Mr. McCrossan continued by discussing phasing recommendations of the Study. Potential near-term corridors include start-up commuter rail service, and LRT/BRT service on Bell Road from Scottsdale Rd. to 59th Avenue, Glendale Avenue, I-10 West, Main Street, Metrocenter/I-17, Scottsdale Road from Camelback to the Central Phoenix/East Valley Light Rail line, and SR-51 from Central to Cactus.

Mr. McCrossan described recommended next steps for high capacity transit. Additional analysis is needed, including major investment studies and environmental analysis for near-term corridors. This analysis would identify precise alignments and technologies. Commuter rail opportunities to be addressed include relocating freight operations along the BNSF and continued negotiations with the UP. He concluded that there is a good case for high capacity transit in the MAG region. The strong BRT/LRT grid network proposed would enhance local mobility and regional connectivity. The proposed commuter rail is equal to or better than many recent new starts, in terms of projected ridership. Mr. McCrossan concluded his presentation.

Ms. Kavanaugh asked if the study addressed the issue of BRT on Grand Avenue. Mr. McCrossan stated that BRT as an alternative to commuter rail was not recommended in this study and was not analyzed in detail. He recommended that this analysis be done as part of the funded major investment study along Grand Avenue.

Mr. Fairbanks expressed concern with the study because Phoenix had asked that BRT/LRT along Baseline Road be considered. However, their request for this corridor is not included in the final recommendations. He noted that the City's research and statistics show tremendous use of the current bus service along Baseline Road by the low income community. Mr. Fairbanks commented that the same study shows that commuter rail is a near-term priority when commuter rail is not in operation yet. Commuter rail is very costly with low ridership, and there is currently a huge demand by low-income residents for transit service along Baseline Road. Mr. Fairbanks stated he felt the need to speak out for the low income residents. He asked if there was a bias in the study toward low-income residents, and that if the needs of the suburbs were more important than the needs of the central city low-income residents.

Mr. McCrossan stated that Baseline was included within both levels of corridor analysis of the study. The corridor was also re-analyzed with the new Draft 2 socioeconomic projections, and it still did not appear to have sufficient ridership to support high capacity transit investment. Mr. McCrossan stated that he was surprised that the corridor did not come out better in the evaluation with the future socioeconomic projections given the growth in the region, and that the corridor appeared to provide good east/west mobility. However, this study is a high capacity transit study, and Baseline might be served by some lower level of transit service, such as the Valley Metro Rapid service currently being pursued. It might be better served by enhanced bus service, or a skip stop bus service as an enhancement of that corridor. Mr. McCrossan stated that BRT and light rail serve different markets.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that he was not opposed to commuter rail, just that the model seemed to contradict statistics. Mr. McCrossan stated that the model did not show that transit riders would not ride transit along Baseline, but that since this is a high capacity transit study that the corridor might be better served by a lower capacity technology, such as improved bus service. The recommendations of the HCT study do not preclude that option. With regard to commuter rail and cost effectiveness, although the cost effectiveness of commuter rail is lower than that of BRT/LRT, the cost effectiveness of the proposed commuter rail lines in the MAG region are in line with recent new start projects in the Western U.S. Mr. Fairbanks stated that it seemed that the higher priority was to serve the suburbs than the lower income areas. Mr. McCrossan replied he would not characterize it as that.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification of the level of detail on Title VI populations. Mr. McCrossan stated that an analysis of impacts on ethnic groups was done, but not a forecast of ethnic breakdown in 40 years, because future data of ethnicity is not available. The analysis used current numbers in determining environmental justice impacts. Mr. Smith asked how the model could be used to project high capacity considers minority population needs. Mr. McCrossan stated that the study looked at impacts by traffic analysis zones and census tracts.

Mr. Smith proposed bringing in maps to show minority populations, and to provide some background on how the environmental justice population needs were addressed.

Mr. Driggs stated that clarification of how BRT is defined is needed. Sometimes there is difficulty in understanding technologies due to semantics. He stated that this area uses BRT on existing right of way with other vehicles, whereas other areas have BRT usage on dedicated right of way. The new Metro Rapid service does not use a dedicated right of way, yet we call it BRT. Mr. Driggs commented that at this point, he did not think we want to define BRT as dedicated usage. Mr. McCrossan stated that the analysis was predicated on BRT as dedicated usage. The HCT study only looked at BRT as dedicated usage. Mr. McCrossan added that the study's recommendations are corridor-based. To determine the specific technology in these corridors, whether they should be LRT or BRT, and where the alignment within the corridor should be, would need to be taken forward on individual corridor studies. Mr. McCrossan emphasized that this study looks at fully dedicated BRT without a shared right of way, which does require a higher ridership projection to justify its cost.

Chairman Ellis asked members if they had other issues that needed to be addressed. Hearing none, Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. McCrossan for his presentation.

Amber Wakeman replaced Will Manley. Jim Huling replaced Mr. Hutchinson.

7. Regional Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Anderson provided an update on the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that is being developed by the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). He stated that the RTP is the largest planning effort in the region in 40 years and will provide a blueprint for regional transportation investments for the next 20 years. Mr. Anderson stated that numerous background studies that will provide input into the RTP are mostly complete. He stated that the goals and objectives have been adopted by the TPC. Mr. Anderson stated that at their April meeting, the TPC will discuss the draft performance measures that will show which investments

will return the best value. He displayed a chart of regional funding sources, of which \$8.3 billion are projected from the half cent sales tax. Mr. Anderson stated that staff has been developing a conceptual framework for the development of the alternatives packages for consideration by the TPC. Three modeling scenarios (Scenario A: Higher Freeway Emphasis; Scenario B: Higher Arterial Street Emphasis; and Scenario C: Higher Transit Emphasis) were developed to check the performance of the projects in the transportation model. Mr. Anderson reviewed the next steps in the RTP process, with approval of the draft plan in September for air quality conformity.

David Evertsen asked about the CANAMEX Corridor. Mr. Anderson replied that the Regional Council has gone on record for a preferred alternative for CANAMEX through the MAG region as I-8 from I-10 to Gila Bend, SR 85 from I-8 to I-10, I-10 west to Wickenburg/Vulture Mine Road, then north to the proposed Wickenburg Bypass and SR 93/US 60. Mr. Anderson noted that an official designation of the CANAMEX route in federal legislation requires Congressional action.

8. 2005 Population Options Status Report

George Pettit, chair of the Population Options Subcommittee, provided a status report on alternatives to conducting a special census. Mr. Pettit stated that the Subcommittee has continued to meet with the Census Bureau on cost estimates for a survey that would include Group Quarters and homeless. He stated that a memorandum of understanding is needed to be in place by March 2004 to conduct a survey in September 2005. Mr. Pettit noted that the third read of the bill that will allow population estimates or a survey to be used in place of a special census to distribute state shared revenue will be heard later in the afternoon of April 9.

Mr. Cleveland asked the date when financial commitments would be needed. Mr. Pettit replied that some financial commitment would need to be made by March 2004, but the amount has not been negotiated in detail. He said that each community would need to figure a portion of the total into the next fiscal year budgets, with the remainder budgeted for the following year. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Pettit for his report.

9. Update on the Development of the FY 2004 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

Mr. Smith stated that at the March Management Committee meeting, a draft copy of the FY 2004 MAG Unified Planning Work Program was presented. It was noted at the meeting that a presentation in April was not planned unless additional issues arose that needed to be discussed. At the March 27, 2003 Transportation Review Committee meeting, certain projects proposed for the FY 2004 Work Program were suggested by some members for deletion from the program. Mr. Smith added that the TRC forwarded the issues to the Management Committee in order to resolve them prior to approval of the Work Program and Budget in May.

Mr. Anderson provided an overview of the Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis. He stated that the concern expressed at the TRC meeting is that individual cities have knowledge regarding bottlenecks on the arterial street system. Although many cities have conducted such analysis to some extent, we are not aware of any comprehensive, region-wide study that is based on common data and using consistent criteria. Mr. Anderson stated that MAG is completing the

travel speed study that will result in an extensive database that will provide information on the characteristics and travel speeds on most of the arterial street system. He added that the concept of the proposed arterial bottleneck study is to use the results on the travel speed study and additional field work to identify specific locations that inhibit regional traffic flow. Once the locations are identified, a system would be developed to rank the locations. The locations that appear to offer the highest capacity improvement would then be analyzed further to specifically identify possible solutions that could be funded. Mr. Anderson stated that another consideration is that a portion of the proceeds from a possible extension of the half cent sales tax for transportation may be allocated for major arterial street improvements. With the database from the travel speed study and the results of the arterial street bottleneck study, MAG would have an important information base that would enable the Transportation Policy Committee and the Regional Council to make better decisions on the allocation of the street improvement dollars. He provided four possible options: A) Fund the project as proposed. B) Drop the project from further consideration and rely on each jurisdiction to identify arterial street bottlenecks and possible solutions. C) Defer the study until a later time. D) Propose to phase the study with Phase I oriented toward identifying bottlenecks and Phase II oriented toward identifying solutions and priorities.

Mr. Anderson provided an overview of the Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines Update. He advised that some TRC members were uncertain that the update was needed or cost effective. Mr. Anderson explained that the Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines is a comprehensive manual of pedestrian policies and facility design guidelines that creates a regional standard used by community groups, planners and design professionals, identifies types of pedestrian areas commonly found in the MAG region, and proposes policies and design elements to promote walking. Mr. Anderson stated that updating the Guidelines is supported by the MAG Pedestrian Working Group and is also an important part of the Elderly Mobility Action Plan. Mr. Anderson provided options for the update of the Guidelines: A) Fund the project as proposed. B) Defer the update to a later fiscal year and continue to use the existing guidelines which were adopted eight years ago. C) Use a Stakeholder Group to update the design guidelines.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who stated that the Work Program is insufficient because the Regional Freeway Program and transit do not encompass all in the region. Mr. Crowley stated that MAG is not as up to speed as the County in providing pedestrian projects and MAG needs to be multimodal. Mr. Crowley commented that at the joint public hearing, there were inconsistencies in the presentations on the agenda. He stated that the RPTA Board will not meet between January and May. Mr. Crowley stated that there are quality of life issues associated with pedestrian facilities. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

Chairman Ellis requested that the Chair of the Pedestrian Working Group, Bill Pupo, speak to the Group's recommendations. Mr. Pupo stated that the Group recommends that the Pedestrian Design Guidelines be funded. With growth, consistency and continuity are important, and pedestrian mobility is one example.

Mr. Pupo moved to not delete the Pedestrian Design Guidelines in the amount of \$80,000 from the draft FY 2004 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. Mr. Evertsen seconded.

Mr. Fairbanks expressed concern for spending money on a study that will tell us things we already know, when that money could be used toward the building of actual projects. Mr. Fairbanks indicated that he had no issue with funding the Pedestrian Design Guidelines because the amount was minimal, but was concerned about the Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis. He stated that cities already know where the problems are. Mr. Fairbanks expressed his concern with a model that shows that someday there may be a bottleneck, instead of addressing known bottlenecks. Mr. Fairbanks stated that arterials are important and supported including them in our regional system, but he wondered what was the goal of the study.

Ms. Kraus commented that there has never been a regional study of bottlenecks. If we are using regional funding, a regional examination of phasing over 20 years is needed. The analysis will provide the criteria to make judgments. Ms. Kraus commented that the region's arterial system is becoming more important than the freeway system.

Mr. Cleveland requested clarification of the options. Mr. Smith replied that one option would be go forward and include the Analysis in the amount of \$400,000 in the Work Program, and another option would be to proceed with Phase I for approximately \$200,000. He stated that two-thirds of the traffic is carried on arterials. Mr. Smith noted that if HB 2292 passes and arterials will be funded as a component of the RARF, a way will be needed to look at them on a regional basis that could stand up to public scrutiny. Mr. Smith advised that the TPC has adopted a major arterial street definition that refers to interconnectivity, so we are trying to narrow down what those streets can do.

Mr. Pupo commented that it was his understanding that the deletion of the Pedestrian Design Guidelines had only been suggested, but not voted on by the TRC. Mr. Smith noted that the requested action was for a possible recommendation to delete these projects from the Work Program. It was proposed that the Management Committee provide input and direction on these two projects.

Chairman Ellis stated that separate actions could be taken on each project. Mr. Pupo clarified that his motion on the table was to fund the Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines Update. Mr. Evertsen, as second, noted his agreement. A vote taken on the question passed unanimously.

Mr. Pettit commented that sometimes we are studied to death, but the reality is, street problems are not created in and of a community. He moved to include the Arterial Street Bottleneck Analysis in the draft FY 2004 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget. Ms. Kraus seconded.

Mr. Fairbanks stated his support for being responsive to arterial street needs. His comment was we all know our needs and he thought another study would be a waste of money. Mr. Fairbanks expressed concern that models confront reality with illusion and create priorities that ignore the poor.

Mr. Olson asked how the timing of the study would be in relation to the Regional Transportation Plan. Can it be done within the timeframe, and how would the second phase fit in? Mr. Anderson replied if the design portion is deferred in 2005, Phase II could be done if funding

streets comes through from the half cent sales tax, where that money starts flowing in 2006. Mr. Anderson indicated that conducting Phase I with half of the \$400,000 may be more appropriate.

Ms. Kraus asked if the Committee could support the motion to include the \$400,000, but phase the project, and at the end of Phase I, decide if Phase II should be conducted. Mr. Anderson replied that a contract could be written for Phase I only.

Ms. Kraus commented that some communities may not have a planned freeway segment or extensive transit program, but every community would benefit from arterials improvements. Therefore, this study is important to all communities, large or small.

Mr. Cleveland commented that he was hearing from discussion that Option D, "Propose to phase the study with Phase I oriented toward identifying bottlenecks and Phase II oriented toward identifying solutions and priorities," could be appropriate to the motion.

Mr. Pettit, as maker of the motion, agreed. Ms. Kraus, as second, agreed. It was noted that the motion would mean that Phase II would not be conducted unless there was a recommendation by the body.

Mr. Evertsen asked the cost associated with Option D. Mr. Anderson replied that Phase I would cost approximately \$200,000 or less.

A vote on the question passed, with Mr. Fairbanks voting no.

10. Maricopa County Interim Resident Population and Employment Projections

Harry Wolfe stated that MAG is in the process of drafting a new Regional Transportation Plan, which requires the input of socioeconomic projections. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Arizona Department of Economic Security (DES) is responsible for preparing the official state and county control population control totals; however, DES has not yet prepared updated county control totals because of the unavailability of certain census data. He noted that DES developed the last set of official population projections in 1997. Mr. Wolfe stated that because MAG needs to develop control totals for our socioeconomic projections for the Regional Transportation Plan, an updated set of population and employment projections were developed. These projections draw upon work prepared by Arizona State University and the University of Arizona for the Department of Commerce State Economic Strategies Study, and the MAG REMI model. Mr. Wolfe stated that the projections are for 2010, 2020, 2025, 2030 and 2040 and will become the interim control totals for a set of subregional socioeconomic projections that will be brought to the Management Committee and Regional Council in May 2003. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Wolfe for his comments and asked if there were questions.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if the projections assumed that there would be adequate water to accommodate the growth. Mr. Wolfe replied that for long range projections the assumption is that there is enough water to support the regional control total. He added that the question is whether the water is in the right locations. Mr. Fairbanks asked if the premise is the water would be moved to the people, rather than people moved to the water? Mr. Wolfe replied that was correct.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who commented that employment, highway improvements, and economic projections in the MAG Urban Atlas were not consistent with MAG's current model.

Mr. Driggs asked for clarification of the control total, not presuming moving water to people, just that sufficient water would be available in the County. Mr. Wolfe replied that was correct.

Mr. Cleveland moved to recommend accepting the Maricopa County resident population and employment projections for 2010, 2020, 2025, 2030 and 2040 for use as interim projections. Mr. Fairbanks seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

11. Legislative Update

Mr. Smith stated announced success on the inclusion of safeguards in HB 2292. He noted that the bill is scheduled to go the floor of the Senate April 10. He noted that the legislation includes a November 2004 election date, and it would be preferable to have language that states a 2004 election. Mr. Smith expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Intergovernmental Representatives and the business coalition on the legislation.

Chairman Ellis recognized public comment from Mr. Crowley, who asked why the RPTA Board was not meeting and discussing this legislation? He commented on providing input into the Transit Report. You are not listening to what the public is saying. Economical options need to be a consideration. Chairman Ellis thanked Mr. Crowley for his comments.

12. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity was provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Mr. Dille requested information on the ADOT aeronautic project deferrals. He stated that there does not appear to be a coordinated effort on this. Chairman Ellis advised that Harry Wolfe is the staff contact. He added that this issue would be brought back to the Committee if appropriate.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary